

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 11 and 25 have been amended to present the claims in better form for allowance and for possible consideration on appeal. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to accept the proposed amendments. Claims 10 and 34 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-9 and 11-33 are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Edwards, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,539,501 ("Edwards").

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method of providing filtered unified logging, the method comprising:
receiving a message, the message having a predefined severity, the message including a trace message and a log message, the trace message associated with a location, the location representing a delimited code area including one or more of a code package and a code class, the log message associated with a category, the category representing a code problem area including one or more of a database problem and a security audit problem;
dropping the message if the message severity does not reach a threshold severity;
applying one or more filters to the message if the message severity reaches the threshold severity; and
sending the message to a destination if the message is not filtered out.
(emphasis supplied).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the reference and the pending claims. For example, the Examiner references col. 3, lines 29-36 of Edwards to find support for disclosing some of the limitations of claim 1. The referenced section of Edwards discloses a "severity parameter 22 indicates whether the

log method is for an error message, warning or information. For instance, if the *software developer is inserting the log method trace statements into the source code* 6 to debug an error, then the error severity level may be used. A message parameter 24 allows *the user to specify a particular message to display* in the log file 14." (col. 3, lines 29-36); (emphasis added).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites "receiving a message, the message having a predefined severity . . . dropping the message if the message severity does not reach a threshold severity; applying one or more filters to the message if the message severity reaches the threshold severity; and sending the message to a destination if the message is not filtered out." (emphasis added). Nowhere in the referenced section or in Edwards "receiving a message, the message having a predefined severity" or "dropping the message if the message severity does not reach a threshold severity" of claim 1 (emphasis added) is taught. Merely using a *severity parameter to indicate an error* as disclosed by Edwards is not the same as receiving or dropping a message based on a severity threshold as recited by claim 1. Furthermore, Edwards does not teach or reasonably suggest "applying one or more filters to the message if the message severity reaches the threshold severity; and sending the message to a destination if the message is not filtered out" as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added). For example, the use of "*the user to specify a particular message to display*" is not the same as "*sending the message to a destination*" as recited by claim 1.

However, for the sake of expediting issuance of this case, Applicants propose additional amendments to the pending claims and submit the following remarks. Claim 1, as amended, in pertinent part, recites "receiving a message, the message having a predefined severity, the message including a trace message and a log message, the trace

message associated with a location, the location representing a delimited code area including one or more of a code package and a code class, the log message associated with a category, the category representing a code problem area including one or more of a database problem and a security audit problem". (emphasis supplied). Edwards does not teach or reasonably suggest "receiving a message, the message having a predefined severity, the message including a trace message and a log message" as recited by claim 1. Furthermore, Edwards does not teach or reasonably suggest "the trace message associated with a location, the location representing a delimited code area including one or more of a code package and a code class, the log message associated with a category, the category representing a code problem area including one or more of a database problem and a security audit problem" as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 11 and 25 include limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 25 and their dependent claims.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 31, 2007

Brent E. Vecchia
Brent E. Vecchia
Patent Agent
Reg. No. 48,011

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980

Docket No: 6570P032
Application No.: 10/748,012

11